

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
OF THE STATE BOARD OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE
REGARDING CHANGES IN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE LAWS

Submitted to the Chairman of the
Welfare Committees of the Senate
and the House of Representatives
of the General Assembly of Penn-
sylvania, February 17, 1941

PROPERTY OF LIBRARY
Bureau of Research and Statistics
Department of Public Assistance

Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
General Library Bureau
Government Publications Section



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE
HARRISBURG

February 17, 1941

The Honorable William A. Shaw
Chairman
Welfare Committee
House of Representatives
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Dear Mr. Shaw:

I have the honor to submit herewith for the information and consideration of your Committee a memorandum statement of certain "Comments and Recommendations of the State Board of Public Assistance Regarding Changes in the Public Assistance Laws."

This statement, approved by the State Board of Public Assistance at its meeting held February 14, 1941, deals with matters bearing directly on the work of the Department of Public Assistance and County Boards of Assistance. It is based on recommendations of the Department and the County Boards and the State Board's own review of the questions involved.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Frank A. Robbins, Jr.", followed by a diagonal line.

Frank A. Robbins, Jr.
Chairman, State Board
of Public Assistance.

1944

The following is a list of the
names of the persons who
were present at the meeting
held on the 1st of June 1944
at the residence of Mr. J. H. H.

Mr. J. H. H.

Mr. J. H. H. was present at the meeting
and was the only person who
was not present at the meeting
held on the 1st of June 1944
at the residence of Mr. J. H. H.

Mr. J. H. H. was present at the meeting
and was the only person who
was not present at the meeting
held on the 1st of June 1944
at the residence of Mr. J. H. H.

Mr. J. H. H.

Mr. J. H. H.

- Mr. J. H. H.
- Mr. J. H. H.
- Mr. J. H. H.



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE
HARRISBURG

February 17, 1941

The Honorable Charles A. P. Bartlett
Chairman, Committee on Welfare,
Public Assistance and Pensions
Senate of Pennsylvania
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Dear Senator Bartlett:

I have the honor to submit herewith for the information and consideration of your Committee a memorandum statement of certain "Comments and Recommendations of the State Board of Public Assistance Regarding Changes in the Public Assistance Laws."

This statement, approved by the State Board of Public Assistance at its meeting held February 14, 1941, deals with matters bearing directly on the work of the Department of Public Assistance and County Boards of Assistance. It is based on recommendations of the Department and the County Boards and the State Board's own review of the questions involved.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Frank A. Robbins, Jr.".

Frank A. Robbins, Jr.
Chairman, State Board
of Public Assistance.

P R E F A C E

Pennsylvania's public assistance laws give the State Board of Public Assistance responsibility for adopting general "rules, regulations and standards, consistent with law, as to eligibility for assistance and as to its nature and extent." "Within the limits of the law and these State-wide regulations, the County Assistance Boards establish local policies based on local conditions and determine eligibility for assistance in individual cases. Over-all supervisory and administrative responsibility for the public assistance program is vested in the Department of Public Assistance.

The public assistance program is currently providing for:

- A. 100,000 persons on old age assistance rolls
- B. 13,000 persons on blind pension rolls
- C. 54,000 cases, representing 186,000 persons,
on aid to dependent children rolls
- D. 140,000 cases, representing 362,000 persons,
on general assistance rolls.

Approximately 91,000 of the general assistance cases include an employable person. These employable persons and their dependents account for an estimated 256,000 of the persons on the general assistance rolls and represent the smallest unemployment relief load supported by the State since initial organization of State-wide relief in 1932. The remainder of the general assistance recipients and the recipients of the three special types of assistance (a total of 405,000 persons) reflect a problem of long-range nature, unlikely to be affected directly by changes in employment levels.

PROPERTY OF LIBRARY
Bureau of Research and Statistics
Department of Public Assistance

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The State Board of Public Assistance has received from the various County Boards a number of recommendations for changes in the present public assistance laws. Certain additional matters requiring legislative consideration and determination have been brought to the attention of the State Board by the Department of Public Assistance. The Board has also received communications relative to legislation from a number of organizations and individuals.

On the basis of the various recommendations received and its own review of the questions involved, the State Board of Public Assistance recommends the following changes in or additions to the public assistance laws.

1. Compulsory Milk Orders

RECOMMENDATION: Act 383 of 1939, requiring the issuance of milk orders to families including dependent children and requiring that the cost of such orders be deducted from the assistance allowance, should be repealed.

COMMENT: This act has proved to be both costly and unsound. Thirty-one of the County Boards of Assistance, including large and small, and urban and rural counties in all sections of the State have condemned the compulsory milk order plan on the basis of local experience and on a wide variety of grounds. One County Board has recommended retention of the law. Copies of the resolutions of these County Boards are appended to this memorandum.

Studies by the Department of Public Assistance indicate that administration of this act is currently costing the Commonwealth a minimum of \$180,000 annually in added administrative costs and \$540,000 annually in loss of Federal participation which would otherwise be available in the Aid to Dependent Children program, or a total of not less than \$720,000 a year.

There is substantial evidence from the County Boards and from medical and public health authorities that forced purchase of fresh fluid milk, as required by the act, frequently runs counter to the welfare and health interests of the families concerned.

It is the unqualified judgment of the State Board that this Act, after a fair period of trial, has shown itself to be disadvantageous to the State's taxpayers and to the recipients of assistance and that its continuance is not justified.

2. Federal Food Stamp Plan

RECOMMENDATION: Enabling legislation should be adopted to facilitate establishment of revolving funds needed in the operation of the Federal Food Stamp Plan, further expansion of which has been blocked in Pennsylvania by lack of such revolving funds for county and larger areas.

Such legislation should provide:

- A. That county governments may appropriate moneys to initiate a revolving fund to be used in the purchase of Food Stamps from the Federal Surplus Marketing Administration, such stamps to be sold by the Department of Public Assistance to eligible participants in the Food Stamp Plan and the proceeds to be returned to the revolving fund; and that any county moneys so appropriated as well as any moneys appropriated by other political subdivisions for the same purpose may be pooled under the custody of a single trustee for operation of the Food Stamp Plan in areas comprising a county or a group of counties; or
- B. That the Governor, on recommendation of The Secretary of Public Assistance, may allocate money from the appropriation of the Department of Public Assistance for a revolving fund to be used in operating the Food Stamp Plan in any area of the State, and that this fund be under custody of the State Treasurer and be subject to requisition by the Secretary of Public Assistance.

It is also recommended that the General Assembly memorialize Congress to adopt legislation permitting the Federal government to advance a reasonable supply of Food Stamps to proper State agencies on a consignment basis and without exchange of money, thus eliminating need for the type of revolving funds now required.

COMMENT: The Federal Food Stamp Plan is currently operating in the cities of Allentown, Bethlehem, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Scranton and in Allegheny County outside of Pittsburgh.

In the balance of the State, surplus foodstuffs purchased by the Federal government and shipped to the State, are distributed directly to relief families by the Department of Public Assistance, which maintains necessary warehouses and distribution facilities, and sponsors a WPA project to handle receiving and packaging of shipments.

Public officials, business groups and other citizens' organizations in many communities have urged extension of the Food Stamp Plan to their areas. Experience of the Department of Public Assistance indicates that the plan is definitely advantageous to needy families and has the merit of greater simplicity and economy of operation than the direct distribution system, provided Stamp Plan operations can be extended sufficiently to permit complete replacement of direct distribution in sizeable geographic areas. From the standpoint of both the Department of Public Assistance and the Federal Surplus Marketing Administration, further extension of the Stamp Plan is feasible only where this requirement can be met, with consequent elimination of warehousing and other distribution costs for a group of counties. Lack of enabling legislation to permit establishment of adequately large revolving funds thus stands as a serious obstacle in the way of expansion which might otherwise take place.

Establishment of the Stamp Plan on a county-wide basis has been possible in Allegheny County only because a private foundation advanced the revolving fund for the area outside of Pittsburgh with the understanding that it would be replaced with county funds whenever necessary enabling legislation should be adopted. Other counties are currently seeking advances of private funds on the same basis.

In the judgment of the Department of Public Assistance and the State Board the best solution of the revolving fund problem would be action by the Federal Congress to permit the furnishing of a reasonable supply of Food Stamps to proper State agencies on a consignment basis and without exchange of money.

Since such Federal action cannot be assured, it seems desirable that State legislation be adopted without delay to permit expansion of the Stamp Plan in Pennsylvania under existing Federal regulations.

Of the two methods of assuring revolving funds recommended above, the second alternative, namely, "That the Governor, on recommendation of The Secretary of Public Assistance, may allocate money from the appropriation of the Department of Public Assistance for a revolving fund to be used in operating the Food Stamp Plan in any area of the State; and that this fund be under custody of the State Treasurer and be subject to requisition by the Secretary of Public Assistance," appears to be preferable from the standpoint of flexibility and administrative economy. A single revolving fund in the State Treasury would greatly reduce bonding and insurance costs, simplify accounting procedure and reduce the State-wide amount of operating capital needed for the sale of stamps by the Department.

In the event that the first alternative is adopted, authorizing counties to provide funds, it will be essential to economical operation that legal sanction be given for the pooling of such funds on an area basis.

3. Residence and Settlement Requirements for General Assistance

RECOMMENDATION: Section 9(d) of the Public Assistance Law of 1937, as amended by Act 384 of 1939, should be further amended to make legal settlement, rather than legal settlement plus two years residence immediately prior to application, the basis of determining eligibility for general assistance of persons eligible in all other respects. If it is desired to place greater residence restrictions around eligibility for general assistance, it is recommended that consideration be given to amending the present statutory definition of legal settlement rather than continuing a residence requirement in addition to legal settlement.

COMMENT: Under the Institution District Act of 1937, as amended, legal settlement in Pennsylvania is acquired by one year's continuous residence in the State without becoming a public charge. The Public Assistance Law originally required one year's continuous residence in the State immediately prior to application as a condition of eligibility for general assistance. In 1939 the Department of Public Assistance recommended to the Legislature that a requirement of legal settlement in Pennsylvania be substituted for the one year's residence requirement. Act 384 of 1939 made legal settlement a requirement for general assistance but at the same time retained a residence provision, necessitating two years continuous residence

immediately prior to application.

The amended law, while intended primarily to prevent destitute persons from other States migrating to Pennsylvania and becoming a charge on the Commonwealth, has actually at the same time created a "no man's land" with respect to certain needy individuals and families who are the responsibility of this State in the sense that they have legal settlement here, but who are ineligible for assistance because they have been out of the State within two years prior to application. Although the amended law leaves no public provision for persons in this class, they cannot be returned to or be publicly aided in another State because their legal settlement is in Pennsylvania.

The Department and County Boards of Assistance have been confronted with serious problems in numbers of individual cases as a result of the conflict between the present residence and settlement requirements for general assistance. The Attorney General has ruled that the Department must authorize the return to Pennsylvania of any needy person with settlement in this State when requested to do so by the public relief authorities of another state. (Similarly other States authorize the return of persons whose settlement they acknowledge when such persons become destitute and in need of public aid in Pennsylvania.) The Department is thus required to authorize the return of needy persons who are considered as belonging in Pennsylvania by virtue of legal settlement but who are ineligible for assistance because of inability to meet the two years' residence requirement. In addition to the problem of individuals or families returned to Pennsylvania by the welfare officials of other states, an identical problem arises in the case of persons with Pennsylvania settlement who are residing in this State but are unable to meet the residence requirement and cannot be sent elsewhere if in need.

At the present time needy persons requiring institutional care are furnished such care by the County Institution Districts if they have legal settlement, whether they have been residing in Pennsylvania or have been returned from another state. Adoption of a similar provision with respect to non-institutional general assistance would fill the existing gap in the total public aid program of the Commonwealth, while at the same time preserving necessary restrictions against migration of destitute persons from other States to Pennsylvania.

4. Confidential Nature of Case Records

RECOMMENDATION: In order to meet the requirement of the Federal Social Security Act, effective July 1, 1941, that State plans for assistance in which the Federal government participates must provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with assistance administration, the Public Assistance Law should be amended to give the Department of Public Assistance specific authority to establish binding regulations to this effect.

COMMENT: By the amendment of August 10, 1939, the Federal Social Security Act provides that, to be approved by the Social Security Board, a state plan for Old-Age Assistance and for Aid to Dependent Children must "effective July 1, 1941, provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of Old-Age Assistance and Aid to Dependent Children." Officials of the Social Security Board have advised the Secretary of Public Assistance that to meet this provision of the Social Security Act, specific legislation must be adopted by the State empowering the Department to establish regulations restricting the use of information concerning Old-Age Assistance and Aid to Dependent Children applicants and recipients and making it unlawful, except for purposes directly connected with assistance administration, for such information to be disclosed or used.

A proposed amendment to the Public Assistance Law, designed to fulfill all requirements of the Federal Act as interpreted by the Social Security Board, will be submitted separately by the Department of Public Assistance.

5. Revival of Reimbursement Liens Against Property Liable for Repayment of Public Assistance

RECOMMENDATION: In order to protect the Commonwealth's claim to eventual repayment of assistance from the estates of persons owning real property while receiving assistance, and at the same time to eliminate excessive legal costs entailed in reviving judgments against such property each five years over a period comprising the lifetime of the owner and his surviving spouse and children, legislation should be enacted providing that the Executive Director of any County Board of Assistance may file a statement with the county prothonotary setting forth the fact of non-

payment of the Commonwealth's claim, such statement to have the same effect as a revival of judgment by suit.

COMMENT: The Support Law, as amended in 1939, provides that property owned by an indigent person while receiving public assistance shall be liable for eventual repayment of such assistance. The law further provides, however, that judgments against real property arising from this liability may not be executed against the home and furnishings of an assistance recipient during his lifetime or the lifetime of his surviving spouse or dependent children.

In practice, the Department of Public Assistance not only adheres to this provision of law but does not execute judgment against any property needed as a home by survivors of a deceased assistance recipient, even though such survivors are relatives other than those specifically enumerated in the law.

Since it is expected that most claims held by the Commonwealth against property owned while persons received assistance will not be satisfied for a considerable period of time, the Department reports that excessive legal and other administrative costs will be incurred by the State in successively reviving judgments within the statutory five-year limit if it is necessary to effect such revivals by suit.

A proposed act to enable Executive Directors of County Boards of Assistance to file statements of non-payment with the same force and effect as though a writ a scire facias had been issued, served and prosecuted, will be submitted separately by the Department.

6. Outlawing Claims Against State Emergency Relief Board

RECOMMENDATION: Legislation should be enacted providing that persons having claims of any nature against the State Emergency Relief Board shall present their invoices or other evidence of claim to the Department of Public Assistance within six months of final enactment and that claims presented thereafter shall not be honored.

COMMENT: The Public Assistance Law authorized the Department of Public Assistance to liquidate the affairs of the State Emergency Relief Board, which was abolished by law June 25, 1937. The legislation recommended above will enable the Department to close finally all accounts of the State Emergency Relief Board.

ADDITIONAL SUBJECTS

In addition to the matters concerning which specific recommendations are made above, the State Board of Public Assistance desires to call attention to the following subjects which, in the Board's judgment, merit careful consideration at this session of the Legislature.

1. The Relief-Work Program

The Relief-Work Program authorized by Act 401 of 1939 (Pierson) was initiated by the Department of Public Assistance and County Boards of Assistance eighteen months ago. Exhibit B, appended to this memorandum, contains a report by the Secretary of Public Assistance on the first year's operation of the Relief-Work Program, released to the press August 28, 1940.

Although the State Board has no specific recommendations to make regarding Act 401 of 1939 at the present time, it wishes to place on record a number of resolutions of County Boards recommending changes in the Act on the basis of local experience.

Resolutions received from the Allegheny, Bradford, Cambria, Clinton, Lackawanna, Lancaster, Snyder and Susquehanna County Boards recommend an amendment which would "permit employables having small assistance budgets to work out in one week the amount of assistance received during the preceding two, three or four weeks, but not to exceed a total of forty hours to be worked during any one week."

The following are among the reasons cited by individual Boards in making their recommendations:

- (1) "Workman's Compensation rates are authorized on a per capita per week basis."
- (2) "Sponsors of Relief-Work projects must furnish transportation to many of the employables."
- (3) "Employables with small assistance budgets are not acceptable to sponsors of projects because of the compensation involved and because of the problem of establishing work schedules and the resulting problem of supervision and transportation of workers."
- (4) "It is essential to the Relief-Work Program that all employables take part in these projects as far as possible."

Minutes of a meeting of the Allegheny County Board of Assistance, held December 20, 1940, indicate agreement of that Board in urging "modification of the Pierson Act in the following respects:

- "a. Clarification of the workmen's compensation provision.
- "b. Extension of sponsor-eligibility to tax-exempted institutions.
- "c. Permission to work on a monthly instead of a weekly basis.
- "d. Permission to persons receiving assistance to work full time and have the time credited against assistance previously received."

Copies of the resolutions cited are contained in Exhibit B of this memorandum.

2. Responsibility of Grandparents and Grandchildren Under the Support Law

The Pennsylvania Support Law states that "the grandparent and grandchild of every indigent person" as well as other relatives "shall, if of sufficient financial ability, care for and maintain, or financially assist, such indigent person at such rate as the court of the county, where such indigent person resides, shall order or direct."

The State Board has received and wishes to place on record a number of resolutions and expressions of opinion from the County Boards of Assistance recommending changes in the law to eliminate or modify the responsibility of grandparents and grandchildren for each other's support. Twelve County Boards have passed formal resolutions recommending a change in the law. Of these, nine (Adams, Allegheny, Bradford, Clinton, Fulton, Snyder, Tioga, Wayne and York) have recommended the elimination of grandparents and grandchildren from the list of legally responsible relatives. Two Boards (Pifflin and Monroe) have recommended that the law be amended to require a lesser degree of responsibility from grandparents and grandchildren than from other relatives. One County Board (Elk) favors either the elimination or the modification of grandparents' and grandchildren's responsibility.

In addition to the above-noted formal resolutions, reports have been received from the Executive Directors of a number of County Boards regarding the Board's views on the matter. These reports indicate that seventeen County Boards are generally in favor of some change in the law. Fourteen of these seventeen (Bedford, Blair, Cambria, Cameron, Carbon, Clarion, Clearfield, Forest, Huntingdon, Indiana, Juniata, McKean, Sullivan and Susquehanna) are reported as favoring elimination of grandparents' and grandchildren's responsibility; three (Crawford, Lawrence and Perry) are reported as favoring a modification of responsibility.

On the basis of Executive Directors' reports, twenty-five additional County Boards favor an administrative policy of requiring lesser responsibility from grandparents and grandchildren than from other relatives without advocating change in the Support Law. Ten of the Boards in this group (Berks, Centre, Chester, Cumberland, Delaware, Franklin, Lancaster, Northampton, Philadelphia and Venango) specifically favor keeping the present provision of law unchanged. The other fifteen (Armstrong, Beaver, Dauphin, Erie, Greene, Jefferson, Lackawanna, Mercer, Montgomery, Montour, Potter, Schuylkill, Somerset, Westmoreland and Wyoming) have given no direct expression of opinion but presumably believe the present wording of the law acceptable.

Eight County Boards (Bucks, Columbia, Fayette, Lebanon, Lehigh, Lycoming, Union and Washington) are reported by their Executive Directors not as favoring any lesser responsibility for grandparents and grandchildren either in the law or in administrative policy.

The following are among the reasons cited by Boards which have formally recommended or which are reported as favoring a change in the Support Law:

1. Grandchildren are usually fairly young and are struggling to establish themselves. Therefore, they should not be burdened with responsibility for supporting their grandparents.
2. Grandparents are usually elderly and, if they have any income, desire to provide for their own future security at a time when they will no longer be able to work.
3. The responsibility of grandchildren and grandparents does not meet with public approval or cooperation.
4. The investigation and current reinvestigation of grandparents' and grandchildren's ability to support increases administrative costs beyond derived benefits.
5. Most grandchildren and grandparents strenuously object to any assumption of responsibility to support one another.
6. The courts are reluctant to place support orders against grandparents and grandchildren.
7. It is difficult to enforce by law a responsibility which is not naturally felt.

The eight County Boards which are reported as not favoring lesser responsibility for financially able grandparents and grandchildren, either in the law or in administrative policy, offer the following reasons:

1. There has been no problem in enforcing the present law and regulations.
2. Grandparents and grandchildren, if financially able, should provide for each other's support in accordance with procedure applicable to all legally responsible relatives.
3. Families must recognize their inter-dependence and mutual responsibility and not try to shift to the State what is properly their own responsibility.
4. The courts recognize and enforce the legal responsibility of grandparents and grandchildren.
5. The elimination of the responsibility of grandparents and grandchildren would be a step towards relieving other relatives of responsibility and would thus be against good public policy.
6. The County Board has sufficient authority under the present law and regulations to deal intelligently with cases involving support from grandparents and grandchildren.

Copies of the formal resolutions favoring a change in the relatives' responsibility provision of the Support Law are contained in Exhibit C of this memorandum.

RESOLUTIONS OF
COUNTY BOARDS OF ASSISTANCE
REGARDING OPERATION OF ACT 383 OF 1939
REQUIRING ISSUANCE OF MILK ORDERS TO FAMILIES
INCLUDING DEPENDENT CHILDREN AND REQUIRING THAT THE
COST OF SUCH ORDERS BE DEDUCTED FROM THE ASSISTANCE ALLOWANCE

EXHIBIT A

ALLEGHENY COUNTY

Excerpt from Minutes of Meeting of Allegheny County Board of Assistance, December 20, 1940:

"After full discussion, it was agreed, that the Board would urge the following action . . .

"Repeal of the Eccles Milk Bill."

ARMSTRONG COUNTY

The Armstrong County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of September 20, 1939:

"RESOLVED, That, after due consideration by the Armstrong County Board of Assistance, it is the opinion of this Board that the Eccles Milk Bill is so impracticable from the standpoint of administration and, in practice, will provide so little benefit that it is unquestionably a useless and ridiculous piece of legislation and,

"RESOLVED, That the opinion of the Armstrong County Board of Assistance be reported by the Secretary of Public Assistance to the State Board of Public Assistance."

BEDFORD COUNTY

The Bedford County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of May 2, 1940:

"Whereas, a large percentage of the assistance cases in Bedford County reside in sections where delivery of milk is not maintained by licensed milk dealers, and

"Whereas, many of these families do not have daily access to licensed milk retailers or producers, and

"Whereas, the added administrative cost of investigation, revision of budgets, and subsequent adjustment of complaints is burdensome, and

"Whereas, the Compulsory Milk Program appears to discriminate against Assistance recipients to the advantage of organized milk producers, and

"Whereas, many assistance families do not have the facilities for properly keeping fresh milk, and

"Whereas, the adoption of compulsory inclusion of milk as part of the budget amount for food constitutes a step backward in the progress that culminated in the adoption of 'cash relief',

"Be It Resolved, That the Bedford County Board of Assistance recommend the enactment of legislation at the earliest possible time, which will repeal the Eccles Law, and once again permit the assistance recipient the maximum benefit from the food grant."

BLAIR COUNTY

The Blair County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of March 13, 1940:

The Blair County Board of Assistance after carefully studying the results of the Compulsory Milk Program enacted by the last session of the Legislature have determined the following:

- "1. That the Compulsory Milk Program is objectionable to the recipients of assistance.
- "2. That the cost of administering the Milk Program is excessive.
- "3. That in large families the Milk Program forces them to buy more milk than their food allowance would ordinarily justify.
- "4. That some recipients feel that they have been discriminated against to the advantage of the milk dealers.

"THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Blair County Board of Assistance recommends that legislation be adopted by the next session of the legislature rescinding, or drastically modifying, the Compulsory Milk Program."

BRADFORD COUNTY

The Bradford County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of December 26, 1939:

"BE IT RESOLVED: That the Bradford County Board of Public Assistance is hereby on record as disapproving the policy of the present Pennsylvania Milk Act, believing the best interests of the State and its clients could be attained by the inclusion of cash in the grant as heretofore."

CAMBRIA COUNTY

The Cambria County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of April 26, 1940:

"WHEREAS, Many assistance recipients have expressed their objections to this milk program to members of the Board and their staff, and

"WHEREAS, Upon investigation of these complaints and objections to the milk program by members of the Board and their staff they have found many of these valid and well founded, and

"WHEREAS, It is an unfair exercise of power over the less fortunate members of society in dictating the type and form of milk to be purchased from their assistance grant, and

"WHEREAS, Many families in normal and better financial circumstances do not habitually purchase this quantity, type, or form of milk, and

"WHEREAS, Many recipient families are at a loss as to how to cook with fresh whole fluid milk because of the experience and training received from other agencies in planning low budget meals with canned milk and milk substitutes, and

"WHEREAS, In many assistance families there are no refrigeration facilities available, the excess milk spoils, is unhealthful, and is wasted, and

"WHEREAS, In some rural sections, deliveries of milk are irregular and often at a distance from the home, thus exposing the milk to the weather until collected by a member of the family, and

"WHEREAS, Assistance families could increase their already minimized purchasing power by being permitted to purchase milk in any form they choose, and

"WHEREAS, This program increases the cost of an already expensive governmental function defeating the object of economy and providing no additional benefits to the indigent of Pennsylvania in spite of the added administrative cost, therefore

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Cambria County Board of Assistance respectfully recommends that Act No. 323, approved June 26, 1939, be modified at the earliest session of the General Assembly possible, and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, Speaker of the House, the Honorable Howard L. Russell, Secretary of the Department of Public Assistance, Senator from Cambria County, Assemblymen from Cambria County, State Board of Assistance, all County Boards of Assistance, and interested charitable agencies."

CHESTER COUNTY BOARD OF ASSISTANCE CL

The Chester County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of January 24, 1941:

"WHEREAS, in the case of large families, the Eccles Milk Law requires that a disproportionate amount of the food grant be expended for milk, and

"WHEREAS, much of this milk is unwanted by relief recipients and is wasted by them because they lack refrigeration facilities and are not educated in the use of milk as a food, and

"WHEREAS, many relief recipients prefer canned milk because it is easier kept and costs less, and

"WHEREAS, this law works to the advantage of the milk dealer and to the disadvantage of relief recipients, and

"WHEREAS, the cost of administering this program is excessive because of the actual administration and the loss of Federal participation,

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Chester County Board of Assistance recommends the repeal of the Eccles Milk Law at the 1941 regular session of the Legislature, thus permitting relief recipients to use their assistance grants to the best advantage."

CLEARFIELD COUNTY

The Clearfield County Board of Assistance passed the following resolution at its meeting of April 15, 1940:

"WHEREAS, Many assistance recipients have expressed their objections to this program to the Board, and

"WHEREAS, Administrative costs are excessive, and

"WHEREAS, the milk program requires an unreasonable part of the food allowance to be deducted for milk, and

"WHEREAS, The Board finds that the milk program discriminates against recipients to the advantage of the milk dealers,

"THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Clearfield County Board of Assistance recommend that legislation be adopted at the next session of the legislature rescinding the compulsory milk program and permitting assistance recipients to purchase milk as though they were using their normal non-relief income."

COLUMBIA COUNTY

The Columbia County Board of Assistance passed the following resolution at its meeting of May 1, 1940:

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the Columbia County Board of Assistance recommend that legislation be adopted at the next session of the legislature rescinding the compulsory milk program and permitting assistance recipients to purchase milk as though they were using their normal non-relief income."

CUMBERLAND COUNTY

The Cumberland County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of January 31, 1940:

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Cumberland County Board of Assistance go on record as recommending to the Department of Public Assistance at Harrisburg that the present legislation governing milk, Act No. 363, approved June 26, 1939, is not practical and should be discontinued for the following reasons: Because in large families too large a portion of the food allowance is allotted to milk leaving an insufficient amount for other foods which are just as essential as milk; because some families have been trained to use canned milk and do not desire to change this habit; and because we see no reason why portions of assistance should be set aside for milk when there is no difference between milk, bread, coal and other commodities."

DAUPHIN COUNTY

The Dauphin County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of May 14, 1940:

"WHEREAS, The compulsory milk program of the Department of Public Assistance represents additional administrative costs with no additional benefits to the relief recipients, and

"WHEREAS, The compulsory milk bill in actual practice discriminates in favor of the milk dealers and against relief recipients, most of whom are otherwise considered capable of using their money to the best advantage.

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Dauphin County Board of Assistance recommends the repeal of the Eccles Law (compulsory milk program) and thus permit assistance recipients to purchase milk without compulsion and as though they were using their normal non-relief income."

ELK COUNTY

The Elk County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of June 19, 1940:

"WHEREAS, most recipients complain that the required purchase of milk is more than they have been accustomed to use when they purchased milk from their normal income which was larger than the assistance grant, and precludes the purchase of other forms of milk which they are accustomed to and which they find more economical to use in their limited circumstances, and

"WHEREAS the Board considers these complaints justified in most cases, and

"WHEREAS if the policy of granting milk in kind is rescinded the family can still purchase fresh fluid milk and more than a pint per child if they find it to their advantage to do so, and

"WHEREAS there would be elimination of the administrative costs of the Act if it were repealed, and

"WHEREAS there is also a loss of money to the Commonwealth from the Federal Government in the purchase of milk under this law,

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Elk County Board of Assistance recommend that Act 383 approved June 26, 1939 be rescinded or amended by the legislature in the interest of the Assistance Program of the Commonwealth, and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be sent to:

Mr. Howard L. Russell, Secretary of the Department of Public Assistance,

Mr. George B. Stevenson, Pennsylvania State Senator,

Mr. Hereford Wood, Member of the Pennsylvania Assembly."

ERIE COUNTY

Excerpt from the minutes of the meeting of the Erie County Board of Assistance, April 16, 1940:

"The chairman read a resolution adopted by the Blair County Board concerning the Eccles Milk Bill, a copy of which had been forwarded to Erie County. There was a long discussion of this bill, after which it was moved . . . and unanimously carried that, in view of the many complaints received and the excessive administration costs, the Erie County Board of Public Assistance recommend to the Legislature that the Eccles Milk Bill be repealed at the next session."

FRANKLIN COUNTY

The Franklin County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of May 16, 1940:

"WHEREAS, many complaints from relief recipients regarding the carrying out of this law have been received in this office through the staff, and

"WHEREAS, the Board considers these objections are justified, and

"WHEREAS, in giving cash relief instead of relief 'in kind' the assistance program has considered recipients capable of using their money to the best advantage, and

"WHEREAS, the action of the Eccles Law in requiring a portion of the assistance grant to be employed for relief 'in kind' defeats the operation of cash relief, and

"WHEREAS, many families now on assistance did not normally purchase the amount of milk required under this law, and

"WHEREAS, a large number of families now on assistance who in normal times had a very limited income were used to using other forms of milk which they found cheaper, and

"WHEREAS, in certain districts where the recipients live at a distance from the regular milk delivery route they are forced to receive irregular deliveries, thus forcing them to keep the milk too long a time, and

"WHEREAS, in these families and in other families refrigeration facilities are inadequate or nonexistent, making the keeping of milk in summer almost impossible, and

"WHEREAS, the enforcement of the Act causes greatly increased administrative expenses which do not result in a commensurate improvement of the whole assistance program,

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the Franklin County Board of Assistance recommends that Act 383, approved June 26th, 1939, be modified or rescinded by the Legislature as soon as possible and

"BE IT RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the State Senate, the Speaker of the House, Secretary of the Department of Public Assistance, the Senator for Franklin County and the Franklin County Assemblyman."

FULTON COUNTY

The Fulton County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of May 29, 1940:

"WHEREAS, most recipients complain that the required purchase of milk is more than they have been accustomed to use when they purchased milk from their normal income, which was larger than the assistance grant, and excludes the purchase of other forms of milk which they are accustomed to and which they find more economical to use in their limited circumstances, and

"WHEREAS the Board considers these complaints justified in most cases, and

"WHEREAS if the policy of granting milk in kind is rescinded the family can still purchase fresh fluid milk and more than a pint per child if they find it to their advantage to do so, and

"WHEREAS, there would be elimination of the administrative costs of the Act if it were repealed, and

"WHEREAS there is also a loss of money to the Commonwealth from the Federal Government in the purchase of milk under this law,

"BE IT RESOLVED That the Fulton County Board of Assistance recommend that Act 383 approved June 26, 1939 be rescinded or amended by the legislature in the interest of the Assistance Program of the Commonwealth, and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be sent to the

President of the State Senate,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Secretary of the Department of Public Assistance,
Assemblyman of Fulton County,
Senator of Fulton County,
County Boards of Assistance."

HUNTINGDON COUNTY

The Huntingdon County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of June 11, 1940:

"WHEREAS, most recipients complain that the required purchases of milk is more than they have been accustomed to use when they purchased milk from their normal income which was larger than the assistance grant, and precludes the purchase of other forms of milk which they are accustomed to and which they find more economical to use in their limited circumstances, and

"WHEREAS the Board considers those complaints justified in most cases, and

"WHEREAS if the policy of granting milk in kind is rescinded the family can still purchase fresh fluid milk and more than a pint per child if they find it to their advantage to do so, and

"WHEREAS there would be elimination of the administrative costs of the Act if it were repealed, and

"WHEREAS there is also a loss of money to the Commonwealth from the Federal Government in the purchase of milk under this law,

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Huntingdon County Board of Assistance recommend that Act 383 approved June 26, 1939, be rescinded or amended by the legislature in the interest of the Assistance Program of the Commonwealth."

JEFFERSON COUNTY

The Jefferson County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of May 17, 1940:

"WHEREAS, Many assistance recipients having large families are required to purchase more milk than can be sensibly used, and

"WHEREAS, This requires an unreasonable amount of the food allowance to be expended for milk, and

"WHEREAS, The Board finds that the milk program has proven to be advantageous to the milk dealers at the expense of the recipient, therefore

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Jefferson County Board of Assistance recommends that legislation be enacted at the next session of the legislature repealing the Eccles Law (Compulsory Milk Program) and thence permit assistance recipients to purchase milk as though they were using their normal non-relief income."

JUNIATA COUNTY

Excerpt from Minutes of Meeting of Juniata County Board of Assistance, May 1, 1940:

"The Board then discussed the compulsory Milk Program and wish to go on record as approving same."

LEBANON COUNTY

The Lebanon County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of May 22, 1940:

"WHEREAS, many families under normal conditions who have limited income are not accustomed to purchasing the quantity or type of milk as prescribed under the regulations of the compulsory Milk Program of the Department of Public Assistance, and

"WHEREAS, the local established price for such prescribed milk is deducted from the food allowance, leaving a proportionately small allowance for the purchase of other necessary foodstuffs, and

"WHEREAS, the added administrative expense of carrying out the provisions of this compulsory Milk Program could be entirely eliminated without loss to the indigent of Pennsylvania, and

"WHEREAS, this would be a desirable economy under an already expensive governmental function,

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the Lebanon County Board of Assistance recommends to the Secretary of Public Assistance and the State Board of Public Assistance that Act No. 383, approved June 26, 1939, be repealed at the next session of the Legislature."

LEHIGH COUNTY

Excerpt from Minutes of Meeting of Lehigh County Board of Assistance, August 30, 1939:

"The Executive Director brought to the attention of the Board the regulations with respect to the distribution of milk by commodity order. After discussion the Board expressed its disapproval of that method of grant and feels that the individual recipient should have the right to say whether his grant shall be made entirely in cash or partly in cash and milk orders. The Executive Director was instructed to transmit this opinion to the Department in Harrisburg.

LEHIGH COUNTY

Excerpt from letter dated December 6, 1940 to the Secretary of Public Assistance from the Chairman of the Lehigh County Board of Assistance:

"The Lehigh County Board of Assistance has all along disapproved of the law requiring the distribution of liquid milk to children under sixteen in families receiving assistance. The Board has previously expressed its disapproval to you.

"Observation of the policy in operation has only served to confirm our past objections to the measure. It is a hardship rather than a help to relief families and it is very costly to the Commonwealth.

"At its meeting on December 5, 1940, the Board instructed me to write you stating their disapproval of the measure and requesting you to bring this letter to the attention of the State Board.

"It is the definite recommendation of the Lehigh County Board of Assistance that the Act requiring the liquid distribution of milk to relief families be repealed at the regular session of the Legislature."

LUZERNE COUNTY

The Luzerne County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of April 17, 1940:

"WHEREAS, The Compulsory Milk Program is objectionable to recipients of assistance, and

"WHEREAS, The cost of administering the Milk Program is excessive, and

"WHEREAS, It has been found that in large families the Milk Program forces them to buy more milk than their food allowance would ordinarily justify, and

"WHEREAS, Some recipients feel that they have been discriminated against to the advantage of the milk Dealers

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Luzerne County Board of Assistance does hereby recommend that legislation be enacted by the next session of the Legislature either to rescind or drastically modify the present Compulsory Milk Program

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Woodside Committee for their consideration."

PROPERTY OF LIBRARY
Bureau of Research and Statistics
Department of Agriculture

LYCOMING COUNTY

The Lycoming County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of July 11, 1940:

"WHEREAS, Many assistance recipients having large families are required to purchase more milk than can be sensibly used, and

"WHEREAS, This requires an unreasonable amount of the food allowance to be expended for milk, and

"WHEREAS, The Board finds that the milk program has proven to be advantageous to the milk dealers at the expense of the recipient, and

"WHEREAS, The cost of administering this Law and the loss of Federal participation in ADC cases due to distribution of relief in kind increase the total costs of relief administration excessively, therefore

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Lycoming County Board of Assistance recommends that legislation be enacted at the next session of the Legislature repealing the Eckles Law (Compulsory Milk Program) and thence permit assistance recipients to purchase milk as though they were using their normal non-relief income."

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

The Montgomery County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of May 14, 1940:

"WHEREAS, many complaints from relief recipients regarding the carrying out of this law have been received in this office through the staff and

"WHEREAS, the Board considers these objections are justified, and

"WHEREAS, in giving cash relief instead of relief 'in kind', the assistance program has considered recipients capable of using their money to best advantage and

"WHEREAS, the action of the Eckels Law in requiring a portion of the assistance grant to be employed for relief 'in kind' defeats the operation of cash relief, and

"WHEREAS, a large number of families now on assistance who in normal times had a very limited income were used to using other forms of milk which they found cheaper and not injurious, and

"WHEREAS, in certain districts where the recipients live at a distance from the regular milk delivery route they are forced to receive irregular deliveries (for example, receive four quarts of milk at one time, and five days later another four quarts) thus forcing them to keep the milk too long a time, and

"WHEREAS, in these families and in other families refrigeration facilities are inadequate or non-existent, making the keeping of milk in summer almost impossible, and

"WHEREAS, the enforcement of the Eckels Law causes greatly increased administrative expenses which do not result in a commensurate improvement of the whole assistance program,

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the Montgomery County Board of Assistance recommends that Act #383 approved June 26, 1939 be modified or rescinded by the Legislature as soon as possible and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the State Senate, the Speaker of the House, Secretary of the Department of Public Assistance, the Senator from Montgomery County, the Montgomery County Assemblymen and all County Boards of Assistance throughout the State."

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Excerpt from Minutes of Meeting of Montgomery County Board of Assistance, April 18, 1940:

"1. That the Compulsory Milk Program is objectionable to the recipients of Assistance.

"2. That the cost of administering the Milk Program is excessive.

"3. That in large families the Milk Program forces them to buy more milk than their food allowance would ordinarily justify.

"4. That some recipients feel that they have been discriminated against to the advantage of the milk dealers.

"After consideration and discussion, it was moved that we concur with the action of the Blair County Board of Public Assistance relative to Compulsory Milk Law, and that like communication be given to Mr. Simon Hoffman, Representative, and Mr. Snowden, Senator, and that we write the Blair County Board that we have concurred with their opinion and have sent similar request to the legislators of our county."

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY

The Northampton County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of January 8, 1940:

"RESOLVED, That the Board protest against the Milk Act and recommend that it be repealed because of the impossibility of administering it, and that notice of the Board's action be sent to the Assemblymen and Senator from Northampton County."

PHILADELPHIA COUNTY BOARD OF ASSISTANCE

The Philadelphia County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of January 29, 1941:

"WHEREAS, the milk program mandatory under Act #383 of June, 1939, has proven to involve excessive administrative cost; and

"WHEREAS, the program has resulted in a loss of Federal reimbursement to the State for expenditures in connection with milk orders for ADC cases because the Social Security Board does not reimburse the States for any payments to recipients other than cash; and

"WHEREAS, the above two factors are resulting in an estimated loss of approximately \$1,500,000 in State funds during the biennium; and

"WHEREAS, it is well known that health authorities advocate in certain cases the use of less expensive substitutes for fresh milk as equally beneficial in nutrition; and

"WHEREAS, the arbitrary requirement of consumption of a certain amount of fresh milk limits the families' choice of other necessary dietary needs; and

"WHEREAS, the operation of the milk program in Philadelphia is detrimental to the participation of families in the Federal Food Stamp Plan because of the large amount deducted for the families' grants for milk;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Philadelphia County Board of Assistance hereby recommends that the State Board of Assistance recommend to the Legislature, that legislation be adopted at the present session, repealing the Eckles Law (Act #383 of June, 1939) and that no special deduction for milk be made from the total assistance grant given to families."

PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

Excerpt from Minutes of Meeting of Philadelphia County Board of Assistance, May 8, 1940:

"On motion made, seconded and carried, the Board made the following recommendation:

"The Philadelphia County Board of Assistance recommends to the State Board that they use their influence with the Legislative body and the Governor in effectuating a repeal of Act 383 at the earliest possible time."

SNYDER COUNTY

The Snyder County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of May 14, 1940:

"WHEREAS, The milk program of the Department of Public Assistance, mandatory under Act No. 383, approved June 26, 1939, is objectionable because

"1. Administrative costs are excessive.

"2. An unreasonable amount of the food allowance must be expended for milk and many assistance recipients having large families are required to purchase more milk than can sensibly be used.

"3. It discriminates against assistance recipients to the advantage of milk dealers.

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Snyder County Board of Assistance joins with numerous other county boards of assistance and, hereby recommends that legislation be adopted at the next session of the legislature repealing the Eckels Law (Act. No. 383 approved June 26, 1939) and thus permit assistance recipients to purchase milk as though they were using their normal non-relief income.

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Secretary of the Snyder County Board of Assistance be and hereby is directed to forward a certified copy of this resolution to the State Board of Public Assistance in Harrisburg."

SULLIVAN COUNTY

The Sullivan County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of May 4, 1940:

"WHEREAS, Many Assistance recipients have expressed their objections to this program to the Board, and

"WHEREAS, Administrative costs are excessive, and

"WHEREAS, The milk program requires an unreasonable part of the food allowance to be deducted for milk, and

"WHEREAS, The Board finds that the milk program discriminates against recipients to the advantage of the milk dealers, therefore

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Sullivan County Board of Assistance recommend that legislation be adopted at the next session of the legislature rescinding the compulsory milk program and permitting assistance recipients to purchase milk as though they were using their normal non-relief income."

SUSQUEHANNA COUNTY

Excerpt from Minutes of Meeting of Susquehanna County Board of Assistance, May 23, 1940:

"It was moved, seconded and unanimously carried that the County Board go on record as disapproving the present compulsory milk program as outlined in Act 383, approved June 26, 1939."

WASHINGTON COUNTY

The Washington County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of April 26, 1940:

"WHEREAS, Many assistance recipients having large families are required to purchase more milk than can be sensibly used, and

"WHEREAS, This requires an unreasonable amount of the food allowance to be expended for milk, and

"WHEREAS, The Board finds that the milk program has proven to be advantageous to the milk dealers at the expense of the recipient, therefore

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Washington County Board of Assistance recommends that legislation be enacted at the next session of the Legislature repealing the Eckels Law (Compulsory Milk Program) and thence permit assistance recipients to purchase milk as though they were using their normal non-relief income."

RESOLUTIONS OF
COUNTY BOARDS OF ASSISTANCE
REGARDING OPERATION OF ACT 401 OF 1939
ESTABLISHING A STATE RELIEF WORK PROGRAM

EXHIBIT B

For Release:
Wednesday, P.M.
August 28, 1940

Harrisburg
August 28, 1940

The Relief Work Program of the Department of Public Assistance rounded out its first full year of operation this month with a record of 105,376 different State relief recipients employed up to August first; \$7,021,110 worth of labor and service furnished to local governments, schools, hospitals and other tax-supported agencies; and the "less tangible accomplishment of providing an outstanding demonstration of the readiness of the average employable relief recipient not only to work in return for assistance received but to give a good account of himself on the job."

These and other highlights of the State's Relief-Work Program, established by act of legislature last year, were reported by Secretary of Public Assistance Howard L. Russell today in a review of RWP activities from August 1939 through July 1940.

Starting with an average of 1,612 workers credited with earning \$52,380 in assistance grants last August, the scope of the program has increased each successive month, statistics released by the Department show, until, in July, 1940, the number of workers averaged 26,843, representing approximately one-fourth of the State's employable general assistance cases. During the same month earnings, credited against relief payments in accordance with prevailing local wage rates, totaled \$898,622.

"The Relief-Work Program began a year ago as a more or less untried experiment," Mr. Russell said. "Since then, 2602 projects have operated, employing at one time or another more than a hundred thousand different employable heads of relief households.

(more)

"It is significant that most of the difficulties predicted before the program got under way have not materialized. For this I think credit is due to safeguards in the law and in detailed regulations subsequently established by the State Board of Assistance and to the attitude of County Boards, sponsors and assistance recipients toward their respective responsibilities.

"Bona fide refusals to accept work assignments have been negligible. In fact they have consistently run less than one per cent. Work credits have averaged 51 cents per hour and have closely paralleled prevailing wage rates for the occupations involved. Where union wage scales exist, they have almost universally been followed.

"The chief problem most County Boards have run up against has been one of finding enough sound projects, which under the law may not substitute for existing or possible WFA or regular government employment, to provide useful work for those who are entirely ready to take it.

"In the development of the Relief-Work Program increasing emphasis has been placed on the objective of work assignments which will enhance the worker's chance of returning to self-support. We all know that it is generally easier to find a new job if you are already doing or have only recently stopped doing similar work. In such circumstances the employer has more confidence in the job applicant and the applicant has more confidence in himself.

"Although complete statistics are not available, instances running into the hundreds have been reported of RWP workers in all sections of the State obtaining permanent full-time jobs with sponsoring agencies following demonstration of ability while working on a project assignment. An outstanding single example of this kind is the RWP project which has been sponsored by Temple University in Philadelphia. The authorities there recently placed the thirtieth former RWP worker on their regular payroll. All of these thirty men

were called, on the basis of demonstrated ability, to fill permanent jobs as vacancies arose, and the University has advised the Work Division of the Philadelphia County Board of Assistance of their intention of hiring three additional relief workers in September."

The attached table shows for the State as a whole and by counties, the number of RWP workers, amount of assistance worked for and number of projects in operation during July, 1940, and on a cumulative basis for the period August 1939-July 1940, inclusive.

ALLEGHENY COUNTY

Excerpt from Minutes of Meeting of Allegheny County
Board of Assistance, October 2, 1940:

".....the following motion.....was
unanimously passed:

"That the State Board of Public Assistance be
requested to draw up an amendment to the Pierson Act
in order that institutions exempt from taxation because
of the type of service offered be made eligible for
the benefits of the RWP program."

BEDFORD COUNTY

The Bedford County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of December 31, 1940:

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Bedford County Board of Assistance unanimously endorses the following resolution adopted by the Snyder County Board of Assistance on December 16, 1940, and requests its secretary to submit copies of this action to the Secretary of the Department of Public Assistance, and to the State Senator, and Representative of this County:

"WHEREAS, The Pierson Act No. 401, 1939, now decrees that 'During any week any such employable shall work in return for assistance received, he shall be required to work only such number of hours as he would work if paid a compensation by the employer equal to such assistance at a prevailing rate of pay in the county where the work is being done. Such work shall be performed during the week for which the assistance is being or is to be received' and

"WHEREAS, such a provision works to the disadvantage of the sponsor and prevents the employment of employables receiving small assistance grants because of the compensation involved and because of variation in time allotted

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Snyder County Board of Assistance hereby recommends that Section 6 of the Pierson Act No. 401, 1939, be amended to read that 'During any month any such employable shall work in return for assistance received, he shall be required to work only such number of hours as he would work if paid a compensation by the employer equal to such assistance at a prevailing rate of pay in the county where the work is being done. Such work shall be performed during the month for which the assistance is being or is to be received.'"

BRADFORD COUNTY

The Bradford County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of December 4, 1940:

"WHEREAS, Workmen's Compensation rates are authorized on a per capita per week basis for Relief Work Projects, and

"WHEREAS, Sponsors of Relief Work Projects must furnish transportation to many of the employables, and

"WHEREAS, It is essential to the Relief Work Program that all employables take part in these projects as far as possible,

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Bradford County Board of Assistance recommends that the Pierson Act No. 401, 1939 be amended to permit employables having small assistance budgets to work out in one week the amount of assistance received during the preceding two, three, or four weeks, but not to exceed a total of forty hours to be worked during any one week, and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Pierson Act No. 401, 1939, be amended to permit employables to make up time lost on the project, this time to be made up within a thirty day period if they are still receiving assistance. The time worked in any one week shall not exceed forty hours,

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the State Board of Public Assistance, to the State Secretary of Public Assistance, and to the State Representative from this county."

CAMBRIA COUNTY

The Cambria County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of November 29, 1940:

"WHEREAS, Workmen's Compensation rates are authorized on a per capita per week basis for Relief Work Projects, and

"WHEREAS, employables with small assistance budgets are not acceptable to sponsors of these projects because of the compensation involved and because of the problem of establishing and maintaining work schedules and the resulting problem of supervision and transportation of workers, and

"WHEREAS, it is the purpose and intent of the law that all employables receiving assistance work on properly sponsored and available Relief-Work Program projects, therefore

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Cambria County Board of Assistance recommends that the Pierson Act (1939, June 27, P. L. 1184), be amended to permit employables having small assistance budgets to accumulate work credit -- not to exceed a total of forty (40) hours at any one time -- and to be permitted to work off this accumulated work credit in one week or as designated by the Department of Public Assistance, and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Department of Public Assistance, the State Board of Assistance, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, to the State Senator and Representatives from Cambria County, and to Mr. J. A. Small, Director of the Relief Work Division."

CLEARFIELD COUNTY

The Clearfield County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of December 16, 1940:

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Clearfield County Board of Assistance unanimously endorses the following resolution adopted by the Susquehanna County Board of Assistance on October 17, 1940, and requests its Secretary to submit copies of this action to the Secretary of the Department of Public Assistance and to the legislative representatives for Clearfield County, as well as to other County Boards of Assistance:

"WHEREAS, Workmen's Compensation rates are authorized on a per capita per week basis for Relief Work Projects, and

"WHEREAS, Employables with small budgets are not acceptable to sponsors of these projects because of the compensation involved and because of variation in time allotment, and

"WHEREAS, It is essential to the Relief Work Program that all employables take part in these projects,

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Clearfield County Board of Assistance recommend that the Pierson Act, No. 401, 1939, be amended to permit employables having small assistance budgets to work out in one week the amount of assistance received during the preceding two, three or four weeks, but not to exceed a total of 40 hours to be worked during any one week."

CLINTON COUNTY

The Clinton County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of February 4, 1941:

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Clinton County Board of Assistance unanimously endorses the following resolution adopted by the Susquehanna County Board of Assistance on October 17, 1940, and requests its Secretary to submit copies of this action to the Secretary of the Department of Public Assistance and to the legislative representatives for Clinton County, as well as to other County Boards of Assistance:

"WHEREAS, Workmen's Compensation rates are authorized on a per capita per week basis for Relief Work Projects, and

"WHEREAS, Employables with small budgets are not acceptable to sponsors of these projects because of the compensation involved and because of the variation in time allotment, and

"WHEREAS, It is essential to the Relief Work Program that all employables take part in these projects,

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Susquehanna County Board of Assistance recommend that the Pierson Act, No. 401, 1939, be amended to permit employables having small assistance budgets to work out in one week the amount of assistance received during the preceding two, three or four weeks, but not to exceed a total of 40 hours to be worked during any one week."

DAUPHIN COUNTY

The Dauphin County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of January 14, 1941:

"WHEREAS, Unemployed employables with small assistance grants are not acceptable to sponsors of Relief-Work projects because of the administrative difficulties involved and are, therefore, often unable to comply with Act 401 (Pierson Act) 1939

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Dauphin County Board of Assistance recommends that in Section 6 of Act 401 (Pierson Act) 1939 the word 'month' be substituted for the word 'week' and the section be amended to read: 'During any MONTH any such employable shall work in return for assistance received, he shall be required to work only such number of hours as he would work if paid a compensation by the employer equal to such assistance at the prevailing rate of pay in the locality where the work is being done. Such work shall be performed during the MONTH for which the assistance is being or is to be received. The County Board of Assistance shall, in all cases, be the judge of the prevailing rate of pay in the localities for the particular type of work'."

JEFFERSON COUNTY BOARD OF ASSISTANCE

The Jefferson County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of January 22, 1941:

"WHEREAS, Workmen's Compensation rates are authorized on a per capita per week basis for Relief-Work Projects, and

"WHEREAS, employables with small budgets are not acceptable to sponsors of these projects because of the compensation involved and because of variation in time allotment, and

"WHEREAS, it is essential to the Relief-Work Program that all employables take part in these projects,

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the Susquehanna County Board of Assistance recommend that the Pierson Act, No. 401, 1939 be amended to permit employables having small assistance budgets to work out in one week the amount of assistance received during the preceding two, three or four weeks, but not to exceed a total of forty hours to be worked during any one week."

LACKAWANNA COUNTY

The Lackawanna County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of December 27, 1940:

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Lackawanna County Board of Assistance adopt the following resolution and request its Secretary to submit copies of this action to the Secretary of the Department of Public Assistance and to the legislative representatives for Lackawanna County:

"WHEREAS, Workmen's Compensation rates are authorized on a per capita per week basis for Relief Work Projects, and

"WHEREAS, Employables with small budgets are not acceptable to sponsors of these projects because of the compensation involved and because of variation in time allotment, and

"WHEREAS, It is essential to the Relief Work Program that all employables take part in these projects,

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Lackawanna County Board of Assistance recommend that the Pierson Act, No. 401, 1939, be amended to permit Employables having small assistance budgets to work out in one week the amount of assistance received during the preceding two, three or four weeks, but not to exceed a total of 40 hours to be worked during any one week."

LANCASTER COUNTY

Excerpt from Minutes of Meeting of Lancaster County Board of Assistance, December 11, 1940:

"Mr. Hare read the Board Resolution, dated 11/19/40, from the Susquehanna County BA regarding accumulative work credit on the Relief Work Program for employables with small budgets. After discussion, the Local Board was unanimous in its opinion that the Pierson Act No. 401, 1939 should be amended to permit employables, having small assistance budgets, to work out in one week the amount of assistance received during the preceding two, three or four weeks, but not to exceed a total of forty hours to be worked during any one week. Mr. Hare was asked to dispatch a letter to Mr. Russell, Secretary of the Department, informing him of the Local Board's agreement with the suggestions made in the Susquehanna County Board's Resolution, and to state that the Lancaster County BA wishes to add its recommendation to that of Susquehanna County."

PERRY COUNTY

Excerpt from letter dated January 17, 1941, to the Secretary of Public Assistance from the Chairman of the Perry County Board of Assistance:

"At the January meeting of our County Assistance Board, we were interested in copies of resolutions on various subjects submitted by different County Boards.

"May we, in letter form, advise you of our Board's belief in the principles of the Pierson Work Relief Bill allowing assistance recipients the privilege of working for their assistance grants. We desire further to advise you that we believe the intimate knowledge you have from the experiences of the Work Division of the Emergency Relief days will let you decide wisely - if work relief continues - whether or not a recipient should be allowed to work in any one week more hours than represented by amount of assistance grant of the same week."

SNYDER COUNTY

The Snyder County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of December 16, 1940:

"WHEREAS, The Pierson Act No. 401, 1939, now decrees that 'During any week any such employable shall work in return for assistance received, he shall be required to work only such number of hours as he would work if paid a compensation by the employer equal to such assistance at a prevailing rate of pay in the county where the work is being done. Such work shall be performed during the week for which the assistance is being or is to be received' and

"WHEREAS, Such a provision works to the disadvantage of the sponsor and prevents the employment of employables receiving small assistance grants because of the compensation involved and because of variation in time allotted

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Snyder County Board of Assistance hereby recommends that Section 6 of the Pierson Act No. 401, 1939, be amended to read that 'During any month any such employable shall work in return for assistance received, he shall be required to work only such number of hours as he would work if paid a compensation by the employer equal to such assistance at a prevailing rate of pay in the county where the work is being done. Such work shall be performed during the month for which the assistance is being or is to be received.'

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Secretary of the Snyder County Board of Assistance be and is hereby directed to forward a certified copy of this resolution to the State Board of Public Assistance, the State Senator and Representative from this county and to the County Boards of Assistance throughout the State."

SUSQUEHANNA COUNTY

The Susquehanna County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of October 17, 1940:

"WHEREAS, Workmen's Compensation rates are authorized on a per capita per week basis for Relief Work Projects and

"WHEREAS, employables with small budgets are not acceptable to sponsors of these projects because of the compensation involved and because of variation in time allotment, and

"WHEREAS, it is essential to the Relief Work Program that all employables take part in these projects,

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the Susquehanna County Board of Assistance recommend that the Pierson Act No. 401, 1939 be amended to permit employables having small assistance budgets to work out in one week the amount of assistance received during the preceding two, three or four weeks, but not to exceed a total of 40 hours to be worked during any one week,

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the State Board of Public Assistance, to the State Senator and Representative from this county and to the County Boards of Assistance."

RESOLUTIONS OF
COUNTY BOARDS OF ASSISTANCE
REGARDING RESPONSIBILITY OF
GRANDPARENTS AND GRANDCHILDREN
UNDER THE SUPPORT LAW

EXHIBIT C

ADAMS COUNTY

The Adams County Board of Assistance passed the following resolution at its meeting of July 9, 1940:

"WHEREAS: The legal responsibility of grandchild and grandparent to support one another, mandatory under Act #397, approved June 24, 1937, does not meet with public approval or cooperation, and

"WHEREAS: The County Board has been subject to much public criticism in administering this provision of the law, and

"WHEREAS: Most grandchildren and grandparents strenuously object to any assumption of responsibility to support one another, and

"WHEREAS, A legal obligation when established, which is not accepted as just and natural by the persons affected, seldom has any beneficial effect, and

"WHEREAS: The investigation and current reinvestigation of grandparents' and grandchildren's ability to support and hence to determine assistance grants increases administrative costs beyond derived benefits,

"BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, That the Adams County Board of Assistance hereby recommends that legislation be adopted at the next session of the Legislature rescinding the legal responsibility of grandparent and grandchild to support one another, and placing these relatives in the same category as brothers and sisters who have a natural responsibility to care for their indigent kin, and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the State Board of Public Assistance in Harrisburg."

ALLEGHENY COUNTY

Excerpt from minutes of meeting of Allegheny County Board of Assistance, December 20, 1940:

"After full discussion, it was agreed that the Board would urge the following action in regard to existing laws:

- "3. Elimination of grandparents and grandchildren from the Support Law."

BRADFORD COUNTY

The Bradford County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of September 4, 1940:

"WHEREAS, the legal responsibility of grandchild and grandparent for one another does not meet with public approval or cooperation, and

"WHEREAS, administrative costs required for the investigation necessary to carry out the provisions of the Support Law, Act 397, approved June 24, 1937, are thought to be in excess of the benefits derived from the enforcement of the Law, and

"WHEREAS, most grandchildren and grandparents strenuously object to any assumption of responsibility to support one another, therefore

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Bradford County Board of Assistance hereby recommends that legislation be adopted at the next session of the legislature rescinding the legal responsibility of grandparent and grandchild to support one another, and thus place these relatives in the same category as brothers and sisters who have a natural responsibility, if of sufficient financial ability to care for and maintain or financially assist their indigent relatives.

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the State Board of Public Assistance, Secretary Russell, and Wilson D. Gillett, State Representative."

CLINTON COUNTY

The Clinton County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of June 4, 1940:

"WHEREAS, the legal responsibility of grandchild and grandparent for one another does not meet with public approval or cooperation, and

"WHEREAS, administrative costs required for the investigation necessary to carry out the provisions of the Support Law, Act No. 397, approved June 24, 1937, are thought to be in excess of the benefits derived from the enforcement of the Law, and,

"WHEREAS, most grandchildren and grandparents strenuously object to any assumption of responsibility to support one another, therefore

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the Clinton County Board of Assistance recommends that legislation be adopted modifying or rescinding the legal responsibility of grandparents and grandchildren to support one another, and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all assistance boards in the State of Pennsylvania and to the State Board of Public Assistance."

ELK COUNTY

The Elk County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of June 19, 1940:

"WHEREAS, the legal responsibility of grandchild and grandparent for one another does not meet with public approval or cooperation, and,

"WHEREAS, administrative costs required for the investigation necessary to carry out the provisions of the support law, Act No. 397, approved June 24, 1937, are thought to be in excess of the benefits derived from the enforcement of the law, and,

"WHEREAS, most grandchildren and grandparents strenuously object to any assumption of responsibility to support one another, therefore,

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the Elk County Board of Assistance recommends that legislation be adopted modifying or rescinding the legal responsibility of grandparents and grandchildren to support one another."

FULTON COUNTY

The Fulton County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of May 15, 1940:

"WHEREAS the legal responsibility of grandchild and grandparent to support one another does not meet with public approval or cooperation, and

"WHEREAS a legal obligation is established which is not accepted as just and natural by the persons affected and which many times is detrimental to the personal and social well being of the persons involved and seldom has any beneficial effect, and

"WHEREAS the investigation and current reinvestigation of grandparents' and grandchildren's ability to support and hence to determine assistance grants increases administrative costs beyond derived benefits in this community, therefore,

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Fulton County Board of Assistance recommend that legislation be adopted removing the legal responsibility of grandparent and grandchild.

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all other County Boards of Assistance and to the State Board of Public Assistance."

MIFFLIN COUNTY

The Mifflin County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of June 25, 1940:

"WHEREAS, the legal obligation of grandchild and grandparent is not accepted as fair and natural and is found in many cases to be detrimental to the social welfare of the persons involved, and

"WHEREAS, the investigation involved in determining grandchildren and grandparents ability to support increases administrative costs, and

"WHEREAS, the legal responsibility of grandchild and grandparent to support one another does not meet with public approval or cooperation, resulting in criticism of the agency and the State Department,

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the Mifflin County Board of Assistance recommend that legislation be adopted modifying the Support Law to rescind the legal responsibility of grandchild and grandparent for support in those cases where such action would create a hardship on the dependent relative.

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all Assistance Boards in Pennsylvania and to the State Board of Public Assistance."

MONROE COUNTY

The Monroe County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of July 9, 1940:

"WHEREAS, the legal responsibility of grandchild and grandparents for one another does not meet with the cooperation of such relatives, nor with the general approval of the public, and

"WHEREAS, the administrative costs involved in the investigation far exceed the benefits derived, and,

"WHEREAS, the actual responsibility of a grandchild or grandparent is less in the minds of families than that, for instance, of brothers and sisters, therefore,

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the Monroe County Board of Assistance recommend that legislation be adopted to modify the present support law, and,

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the State Board of Public Assistance."

SNYDER COUNTY

The Snyder County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of May 14, 1940:

"WHEREAS, The legal responsibility of grandparent and grandchild to support one another, mandatory under Act 327 approved June 24, 1937, is objectionable because

"1. Public sentiment is almost unanimously against such a requirement

"2. The County Board of Assistance has been subjected to considerable criticism in administering this provision of the law.

"3. The courts of the county have indicated their unwillingness to make orders and decrees upon a grandparent or a grandchild to insure one supporting the other and have, in fact, refused to make such an order or decree in every action brought thus far by a grandparent or grandchild

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Snyder County Board of Assistance hereby recommends that legislation be adopted at the next session of the legislature rescinding the legal responsibility of grandparent and grandchild to support one another and thus place these relatives in the same category as brothers and sisters who have a natural responsibility, if of sufficient financial ability, to care for and maintain, or financially assist, their indigent relatives,

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Secretary of the Snyder County Board of Assistance be and is hereby directed to forward a certified copy of this resolution to the State Board of Public Assistance in Harrisburg."

TIOGA COUNTY

The following is an excerpt from a letter written to the Secretary of Public Assistance by the Executive Director of the Tioga County Board of Assistance, December 19, 1940:

"At a recent meeting held on December 11, 1940, a motion was made and unanimously carried that the Board go on record as being opposed to this requirement and requested that action be taken at the next meeting of the Legislature to have this Law changed so that grandparents and grandchildren will not be required to make these contributions."

WAYNE COUNTY

The following resolution was adopted by the Wayne County Board of Assistance at its meeting of November 21, 1940:

"WHEREAS, The legal obligation of grandchild and grandparent is not accepted as fair and natural, and

"WHEREAS, The investigation of grandchildren and grandparent's ability to support adds to the administrative cost of investigating applicants for assistance,

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Wayne County Board of Assistance recommends that legislation be adopted removing the legal responsibility of grandchildren and grandparent."

YORK COUNTY

The York County Board of Assistance adopted the following resolution at its meeting of May 6, 1940:

"WHEREAS, most grandchildren approached by the local Board and its staff strenuously object to any assumption of responsibility to support their grandparents, and

"WHEREAS, the County Board has been subjected to much public criticism for requiring grandchildren to support grandparents, and

"WHEREAS, the investigation of grandchildren's ability to support adds very greatly to the administrative costs of the Assistance Program, therefore,

"BE IT RESOLVED, that the York County Board of Assistance recommend that legislation be adopted at the next Session of the Legislature rescinding the legal responsibility of grandparents and grandchildren to support one another, and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to all Assistance Boards in the State of Pennsylvania."

